



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

h

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/087,121 | 02/28/2002 | Steven G. Henry | 10017580-1 | 4210 |

7590 10/12/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

JEAN GILLES, JUDE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/087,121 | HENRY, STEVEN G. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jude J. Jean-Gilles | 2143 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Action is in regards to the Reply received on 07/08/2005.

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 02/28/2002. Claim 8 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-11, 14, 15, and 17-19 have been amended. Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4 and 7 have been carefully considered, but are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments are deemed moot in view of the following new ground of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant substantial amendment to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof. The dependent claims stand rejected as articulated in the First Office Action and all objections not addressed in Applicant's response are herein reiterated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-12, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cabrera et al (Cabrera), U.S. Patent No. 6,269,382 B1 in view of Hull et al (Hull), U.S. Patent No. 6,704,118 B1 further in view of Lennon(Lennon) US Patent No. 6,624,843 B2.

Regarding **claim 1**, Cabrera teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Cabrera discloses a method for use with a digital sender device comprising:

inserting a removable data storage media into a removable data storage mechanism arranged within a digital sender device and operatively coupling

operatively coupling a removable data storage media to a digital sender device (*fig. 1, items 20, 29-30; column 8, lines 38-67*);

causing said digital sender device to:

optically scan at least one object to form corresponding scanned object data (*column 24, lines 46-67; column 25, lines 1-31*),
generate an outgoing message data including said scanned object data output said message data (*column 10, lines 1-56; column 24, lines 46-67; column 25, lines 1-30*), and

store said message data on said removable data storage device (*column 8, lines 38-67; column 34, lines 39-47*).

However, Cabrera does not specifically disclose providing recipient data address, and generate an outgoing message (including scanned object) data using said recipient address.

In the same field of endeavor, Hull teaches a method in which (“*...data representing a network address of the source or recipient device can be stored along with the archived image. An IP address can be stored with documents originating from a workstation assigned to that particular IP address...* [see Hull, column 10, lines 3-17].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Hull’s teachings of a method and apparatus to provide recipient address data with scanned object data, with the teachings of Cabrera, for the purpose of “*providing a system and a method for remote storage that allows local storage to be rapidly freed should the need arise to rapidly reclaim local storage, and to provide a hierarchical storage system that maximizes the amount of local storage that can be transferred to a remote storage...*” as stated by Cabrera in lines 28-41 of column 6. By this rationale **claim 1** is rejected.

While Cabrera and Hull substantially disclose the claimed invention, Cabrera and Hull do not specifically teach in detail Inserting a removable media into mechanism; and sending/storing an electronic mail message. However, Cabrera suggests in col. 35, lines 14 that the storage may be embodied in other specific forms...Accordingly, in the same field of endeavor, Lennon teaches a

method in wherein "the approach of inserting a removable media into mechanism and sending/storing an electronic mail message" is fully disclosed , e.g., system,
the controller 102 accesses the necessary customer and reference images and sends them to a computing device resident in the image display system 108,
i.e., the display from which the request for the composite image was received. The computing device that receives the customer and reference images from the controller 102 then generates the composite image. Regardless of the manner in which the composite image is generated, the composite image is displayed at step 516 on the display. Additionally, the composite image can be stored on a removable media such as a compact disc (CD) or digital video disc (DVD) and given to the customer for later reference. If the customer has an established e-mail address, the composite image can be sent via the public or private communication networks 110, 112 to the e-mail address provided. In another alternative, if the merchant has an interactive and secure World Wide Web or .

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Hull's teachings of a method and apparatus to provide recipient address data with scanned object data, with the teachings of Lennon, for the purpose of "*providing a system capable of distinguishing differences between body sizes and is capable of filing in variations...*" as stated by Lennon in lines 45-50 of column 2. By this rationale **claim 1** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 2**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method as recited in claim 1, wherein operatively coupling said removable data storage media to said digital sender device further includes: positioning a writable optical disc in a writable optical disc drive within said digital sender device. [see *Cabrera, column 8, lines 38-67; column 9, lines 1-37*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 2 [see *Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41*]. By this rationale **claim 2** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein said scanned object data further includes a plurality of different versions of said scanned object data [see *Hull, column 10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-26*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 3 [see *Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41*]. By this rationale **claim 3** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 7**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the method as recited in claim 3, wherein said plurality of different versions of said scanned object data includes a first version and a second version, said second version being a data compressed version of said first version [see *Hull, column 7, lines 41-67; column 8, lines 1-26*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 7 [see *Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41*]. By this rationale **claim 7** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the method as recited in claim 7, wherein causing said digital sender device to store said message data on said removable data storage device further includes: causing said digital sender device to store said first version on said removable data storage device [see *Hull, column 10, lines 40-67; column 11, lines 1-26*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 9 [see *Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41*]. By this rationale **claim 9 is rejected.**

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the method as recited in claim 4, wherein said message data includes data selected from a group of data comprising scanned object data, recipient address data, timestamp data, authentication related data, device identifying data, control data, text data, graphics data, and image data [see *Cabrera, column 25, lines 1-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 10 [see *Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41*]. By this rationale **claim 10 is rejected.**

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches an apparatus comprising [see *Cabrera, fig. 1, items 20-54*]: a digital sender device having:

a data storage device configurable to access a removable data storage media [see *Cabrera, column 8, lines 38-67*],

a scanning mechanism configurable to scan at least one object and produce corresponding scanned object data [see Cabrera, column 24, lines 46-67; column 25, lines 1-31],

a communication interface configurable to operatively connect to at least one network [see Cabrera, column 8, lines 38-67; column 9, lines 1-37],

a user interface configurable to receive user inputs [see Cabrera, fig. 1, item 40; column 8, lines 38-67; column 9, lines 1-37], and

logic operatively coupled to said data storage device, said scanning mechanism, said communication interface, and said user interface, wherein said logic is configured to combine recipient address data from said user interface with at least a portion of said scanned object data to form message data that is then output by said communication interface and stored by said data storage device on said removable data storage device [see Hull, column 10, lines 3-17].

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 11 [see Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41]. By this rationale **claim 11 is rejected.**

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the apparatus as recited in claim 11, wherein said scanned object data further includes a plurality of different versions of said scanned object data [see Hull, column 10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-26]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 12 [see Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41]. By this rationale **claim 12 is rejected.**

Regarding **claim 16**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the apparatus as recited in claim 12, wherein said plurality of different versions of said scanned object data includes a first version and a second version, said second version being a data compressed version of said first version [see *Hull, column 7, lines 41-67; column 8, lines 1-26*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 16 [see *Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41*]. By this rationale **claim 16** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 17**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the apparatus as recited in claim 16, wherein said logic is configured to include said second version within said message data that is output by said communication interface [see *Hull, column 10, lines 40-67; column 11, lines 1-26*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 17 [see *Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41*]. By this rationale **claim 17** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 18**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the apparatus as recited in claim 16, wherein said logic is configured to include said first version within said message data that is stored by said data storage device [see *Hull, column 10, lines 40-67; column 11, lines 1-26*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 18 [see *Cabrera, column 6, lines 28-41*]. By this rationale **claim 18** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 19**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the apparatus as recited in claim 11, wherein said message data includes data

selected from a group of data comprising scanned object data, recipient address data, timestamp data, authentication related data, device identifying data, control data, text data, graphics data, and image data [see *Cabrera*, column 25, lines 1-67]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 19 [see *Cabrera*, column 6, lines 28-41]. By this rationale **claim 19 is rejected.**

Regarding **claim 20**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the apparatus as recited in claim 11, further comprising: a multiple function device that includes:

said digital sender device, and a printer mechanism operatively coupled to said logic within said digital sender device, and wherein said logic is further configured to cause said printing mechanism to print out at least a portion of said message data [see *Hull*, fig. 1, item 112; fig. 5, item 512; column 2, lines 21-32; column 3, lines 1-67; column 4, lines 1-60]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 20 [see *Cabrera*, column 6, lines 28-41]. By this rationale **claim 20 is rejected.**

3. **Claims 4-6, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cabrera, Lennon and Hull as applied to claims 1-3, 7-12, 16-20, further in view of Parulski et al (Parulski) U.S. Patent No. 5,440,401 B1.**

Regarding **claim 4**, the combination Cabrera-Hull-Lennonteaches the invention substantially as claimed. Cabrera-Hull-Lennondiscloses the method as recited in claim 3, wherein said scanned object includes a plurality of different versions of said scanned object data. However, Cabrera-Hull-Lennon fails to disclose a said plurality of different versions of said scanned object data that includes a first resolution version and a second resolution version, said second resolution version having a lower level of resolution than said first resolution version.

In the same field ion endeavor, Parulski teaches a method for image data processing whereas, "in the same database storage contains high resolution images, an a low resolution index data file of the same images where images can be retrieved and displayed.." [see *Parulski, column 6, lines 50-67*].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Hull's teachings of a method and apparatus to provide recipient address data with scanned object data, with the teachings of Cabrera, for the purpose of "*providing a system and a method for remote storage that allows local storage to be rapidly freed should the need arise to rapidly reclaim local storage, and to provide a hierarchical storage system that maximizes the amount of local storage that can be transferred to a remote storage...*" as stated by Cabrera in lines 28-41 of column 6. Parulski further provides motivation to combine by stating that "*the accompanying of the low and high resolution will allow the user to readily call up*

*and display the high resolution image associated with a selected low resolution image... [see Parulski, column 2, lines 18-23]. By this rationale **claim 4** is rejected.*

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination Cabrera-Hull- Parulski teaches the method as recited in claim 4, wherein causing said digital sender device to output said message data further includes: [see *Parulski, column 6, lines 6-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 4, applies equally as well to claim 5 [see *Parulski, column 2, lines 18-23*]. By this rationale **claim 5** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 6**, the combination Cabrera-Hull- Parulski teaches the method as recited in claim 4, wherein causing said digital sender device to store said message data on said removable data storage device further includes: causing said digital sender device to store said first resolution version on said removable data storage device: [see *Parulski, column 6, lines 6-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 4, applies equally as well to claim 6 [see *Parulski, column 2, lines 18-23*]. By this rationale **claim 6** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 13**, the combination Cabrera-Hull- Parulski teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 12, wherein said plurality of different versions of said scanned object data includes a first resolution version and a second resolution version, said second resolution version having a lower level of resolution than said first resolution version [see *Parulski, column 6, lines 50-67*].

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 4, applies equally as well to claim 13 [see *Parulski, column 2, lines 18-23*]. By this rationale **claim 13** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 14**, the combination Cabrera-Hull- Parulski teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 13, wherein said logic is configured to include said second resolution version within said message data that is output by said communication interface [see *Parulski, column 6, lines 6-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 4, applies equally as well to claim 14 [see *Parulski, column 2, lines 18-23*]. By this rationale **claim 14** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 15**, the combination Cabrera-Hull- Parulski teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 13, wherein said logic is configured to include said first resolution version within said message data that is stored by said data storage device: [see *Parulski, column 6, lines 6-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 4, applies equally as well to claim 15 [see *Parulski, column 2, lines 18-23*]. By this rationale **claim 15** is rejected.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on 02/07/2005 has been carefully considered but is not fully persuasive. However, it is the examiner's position that the new art of reference Lennon teaches the minor deficiencies of the prior office action.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-9000.

Jude Jean-Gilles
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143


JJG


BUNJOO JAROENCHOAMNIT
BUNJOR PRIMARY EXAMINER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

October 02, 2005